

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 8, and 9 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant adds claims 10-22, which are clearly supported throughout the specification.

**I. Summary of the Office Action**

The Examiner maintained the rejections of claims 1-6, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**II. Prior Art Rejections and Statement of Substance of the Interview**

Claims 1-4, 6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,526,418 to Midgley et al. (hereinafter “Midgley”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,093,135 to Radatti et al. (hereinafter “Radatti”) and claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Midgley and Radatti, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,799,323 to Mosher, Jr. (hereinafter “Mosher”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejections at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Applicant thanks Examiner Patel and Primary Examiner Wang for the courteous in-person interview on September 3, 2008. An Examiner’s Interview Summary Record (PTO-413) was given to the Applicant’s Representative after the Interview. The PTO-413 requires the Applicant to file a Statement of Substance of the Interview. The Statement of Substance of the Interview is as follows:

During the interview, independent claims 1 and 6 were discussed in view of the prior art of record. For example, Applicant respectfully noted that claim 1 recites “[a] computer system connected to a data communications network” where the computer system includes a first and second computers such that “receipt of any data from the data communications network is limited to the first computer” and “transmission of any data to the data communications network

is limited to the second computer.” The Examiner agreed that these claims are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record. The Examiner also indicated that further search is needed and will be performed upon the filing of a formal Response. The Examiner further suggested that Applicant add new claims to further clarify the invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

For at least these exemplary reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 6 are patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 2-5, 8, and 9 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

III. New Claims

In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claims 10-22, which are patentable by virtue of their dependency and for additional features set forth therein.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 AND  
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW  
Application No.: 10/600,643

Attorney Docket No.: Q76086

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Nataliya Dvorson  
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 16, 2008